Appln. No.: 10/645,016

Amendment dated March 26, 2008

Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action mailed November 28, 2007, has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive to that office action. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bergsten et al (US 2003/0001907).

Claims 1-18 and 20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 20 are currently amended, claims 22-38 are new, and claims 19 and 21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Bergsten does not support a proper prima facie case of anticipation of claim 1 because Bergsten does not disclose that "the carousel is displayable as a plurality of carousel elements that rotate around a carousel axis."

Bergsten discloses a user interface that has vertical and horizontal bars that intersect at a focus panel into which particular panels may be shifted. (Bergsten, par. 11 and 25). Bergsten discloses that panels are shifted into the focus panel. But Bergsten does not disclose a carousel that is "displayable as a plurality of carousel elements that rotate around a carousel axis."

On page 3 of the office action, paragraph 25 of Bergsten is cited as showing that the elements of the first sequential subfolder are "presented in a form of a carousel in the sense that they repeat and circulate."

Bergsten does not, however, show that the first sequential subfolder is displayable as carousel elements that rotate around a carousel axis. Regardless of whether the panels in the disclosed horizontal and vertical bars circulate and repeat, Bergsten does not disclose displaying the vertical and horizontal bars as carousel elements that rotate around a carousel axis.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Bergsten does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 20 and 34 contain limitations that are analogous to the limitations of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, Bergsten does not anticipate claims 20 and 34 for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claims 2-18, 22-33, and 35-38 properly depend upon independent claims 1, 20, and 34, respectively, and are, therefore, not anticipated by Bergsten for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1, 20, and 34.

Appln. No.: 10/645,016

Amendment dated March 26, 2008

Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2007

Bergsten does not support a proper prima facie case of anticipation of claim 4 because Bergsten does not disclose "the buffer element is placed in the middle of a rear carousel segment." On page 3 of the office action, paragraph 11 of Bergsten is cited as showing "the buffer element is placed in the middle of a rear carousel segment." Bergsten does not, however, disclose displaying elements in the form of a carousel, let alone presenting a buffer element placed in the middle of a rear carousel segment. Paragraph 11 is silent with respect such a carousel, rear carousel segment, and a buffer element placed in the middle of such a rear carousel segment. For at least the foregoing additional reasons, Bergsten does not anticipate claim 4.

Claim 24 contains a limitation that is analogous to the limitation of claim 4 discussed above. Therefore, Bergsten does not anticipate claim 24 for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 4.

Bergsten does not support a proper prima facie case of anticipation of claim 8 because Bergsten does not disclose "a diameter of the carousel is adjustable." On page 3 of the office action, paragraph 25 of Bergsten is cited as showing "a diameter of the carousel is adjustable." Paragraph 25 of Bergsten does not, however, disclose such an adjustable carousel diameter. For at least the foregoing additional reasons, Bergsten does not anticipate claim 8.

Claims 28 and 37 contain limitations that are analogous to the limitations of claim 8 discussed above. Therefore, Bergsten does not anticipate claims 28 and 37 for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 8.

Bergsten does not support a proper prima facie case of anticipation of claim 9 because Bergsten does not disclose "the diameter of the carousel is adjustable as a function of the number of the plurality of elements of the first sequential subfolder." On page 4 of the office action, paragraph 25 of Bergsten is cited as showing that the diameter of the carousel is adjustable as a function of the number of the plurality of elements of the first sequential subfolder. Paragraph 25 of Bergsten does not, however, disclose a carousel diameter that is adjustable as a function of the number of elements of the first sequential subfolder. For at least the foregoing additional reasons, Bergsten does not anticipate claim 9.

Appln. No.: 10/645,016

Amendment dated March 26, 2008

Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2007

Claims 29 and 38 contain limitations that are analogous to the limitations of claim 9 discussed above. Therefore, Bergsten does not anticipate claims 29 and 38 for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 9.

CONCLUSION

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

> Respectfully submitted, BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 26, 2008

By:

/William J. Klein/

William J. Klein

Registration No. 43,719

10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 3000 Chicago, IL 60606

Tel: (312) 463-5000

Fax: (312) 463-5001